REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, 29, and 32-44 are pending in this application.

Claims 33-44 are added by the present response. No new matter is believed to be added.

Claims 5, 8, 13, 16, 21, 24, 29, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph. Claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, 29, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,202,199 to Wygodny et al. (herein "Wygodny")

in view of U.S. patent 5,414,494 to Aikens et al. (herein "Aikens") and U.S. patent 6,345,306

to Hintermeister et al. (herein "Hintermeister").

Addressing first the rejection of claims 5, 8, 13, 16, 21, 24, 29, and 32 under 35

U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

The above-noted claims are amended by the present response to no longer refer to

"the target application". The claim amendments are believed to address the rejections under

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, 29, and 32

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wygodny in view of Aikens and

Hintermeister, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

The claims are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein.

Specifically, independent claim 1 now further recites a "clock unit". Independent claim 1

further recites generating a leg of the monitored data "in one of multiple formats, wherein the

multiple formats include at least one of a time stamp including a time of selecting of the

plurality of operations of the operation panel or a frequency of selection of the plurality of

operations of the operation panel". That subject matter is believed to be fully supported by

the original specification, see for example Figures 15-17. The other independent claims are

similarly amended as in independent claim 1 noted above.

Initially, applicants respectfully submit the features clarified in each of the claims

clearly distinguishes over the applied art. That is, none of the cited references to <u>Wygodny</u>,

<u>Aikens</u>, or <u>Hintermeister</u> discloses or suggests to generate a log of the monitored data "in one

of multiple format", wherein "the multiple formats include at least one of a time stamp

including a time of selecting of the plurality of operations of the operation panel or a

frequency of selection of the plurality of operations of the operation panel". Thereby, the

claims as written are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit the claims further distinguish over the

applied art.

According to features recited in the claims, a monitoring unit monitors the selecting of

operations on an operation panel by a user, generates a log of such monitored data, and

communicates data based on that log of the monitored data. With such claimed structures

and operations, which operations a user selects on an operation panel of an image forming

device can be monitored and then logged. Such an operation allows monitoring of exactly

how a user utilizes an operation panel of an image forming device, i.e., what buttons and in

what order the buttons on an image forming apparatus operation panel are pressed by a user is

monitored. With such monitored data it can then be evaluated and determined how a user

utilizes an operation panel of an image forming device, so that that operation panel can then

be improved.

First, applicants note <u>Wygodny</u> is directed to a significantly different device than as

claimed. <u>Wygodny</u> is directed to monitoring execution paths of a software system, which is

referred to as a client (see for example the Abstract of <u>Wygodny</u>). Thus, <u>Wygodny</u> merely

monitors how a software program is being executed. To achieve that result in <u>Wygodny</u> the

system operates to debug a program by installing three components, referred to as a Bug

Trapper agent, a trace control information (TCI) file, and a target application in client computer.

In contrast to <u>Wygodny</u>, the claims are directed to selecting operations on an operation panel of an image forming device selected by a user. <u>Wygodny</u> is not directed to any similar device. In that respect applicants submit the teachings in <u>Wygodny</u> are not at all relevant to the claimed invention.

Moreover, the outstanding Office Action recognizes that <u>Wygodny</u> "fails to specifically teach monitoring selections of operations of an operation panel", and to cure those deficiencies in <u>Wygodny</u> the outstanding rejection cites <u>Aikens</u>.[1]

In reply to that basis for the rejection applicants respectfully submit <u>Aikens</u> also does not disclose or suggest the claimed features, and thus does not cure the deficiencies in <u>Wygodny</u>. That is, <u>Aikens</u> also does not disclose or suggest monitoring selecting of operations on an operation panel of an image forming device by a user.

<u>Aikens</u> is directed to a method of automatic notification of selected remote devices in response to machine conditions detected by a machine monitoring element including display machine condition options for selection of predetermined machine conditions for automatic notification to remote stations.[2] With respect to the above-noted claim limitation of monitoring selections of a user on an operation panel of an image forming device, the outstanding rejections cited <u>Aikens</u> at column 2, lines 25-40. That portion is merely the broad "Summary Of The Invention" section in <u>Aikens</u>, which simply does not indicate that <u>Aikens</u> disclose monitoring data of selection of a plurality of operations of an operation panel. <u>Aikens</u> discloses detecting machine conditions for automatic notification to remote stations, but at no point does <u>Aikens</u> disclose or suggest monitoring what buttons a user

---

[1] Office Action of November 29, 2006, prenumbered paragraph 8 on pages 4-5.
[2] See <u>Aikens</u> in the Abstract.

12

presses on an operation panel of an image forming device. Thereby, <u>Aikens</u> clearly cannot cure the recognized deficiencies in <u>Wygodny</u>.

Moreover, no teachings in <u>Hintermeister</u> cure the above-discussed deficiencies of <u>Wygodny</u> in view of <u>Aikens</u>.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit the claims as written clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The present response also adds new dependent claims 33, 36, 39, and 42 for examination, which recite features canceled by the present response from the independent claims. Specifically, those claims are directed to setting "a number of sections of utilizing the operation panel to be executed by the user prior to communicating the data based on the log of the monitored data". Those features are believed to even further distinguish over the applied art.

With respect to that feature the outstanding Office Action cites <u>Wygodny</u> at column 6, lines 3-14; column 19, lines 17-22 and 55-60; and column 26, lines 30-40.[3]

In reply to that basis for the rejection applicants submit <u>Wygodny</u> does not disclose or suggest setting a number of sections of utilizing the operation panel prior to communicating the log of the monitored data.

At column 6, lines 3-14, <u>Wygodny</u> merely discloses the trace control information (TCI) file including instructions for a trace. At column 19, lines 17-22 and 54-60 <u>Wygodny</u> discloses writing trace data to a buffer and determining a size of each trace record. At column 26, lines 30-40 <u>Wygodny</u> disclose that the trace log file 122 contains information that reflects a time window ending with the writing of the log file.

In each instance noted above <u>Wygodny</u> does not disclose or even address the claim feature of setting a number of sessions of utilizing the operation panel to be executed by the

---

[3] Office Action of November 29, 2006, prenumbered paragraph 7 on page 4.

user prior to communicating the log of the monitored data. The outstanding Office Action

has not pointed to any disclosure in Wygodny that meets such claim limitations.

Thereby, new dependent claims 33, 36, 39, and 42 clearly further distinguish over the

applied art.

New dependent claims 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, and 44 are also believed to recite

additional features that further distinguish over the applied art.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the claims as written

are allowable over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the

present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested

that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

_____
James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\SNS\24's\242160\242160US-AM DUE 2-28-07.DOC

14